

Highlights of the NASA Ames Research Center  
Aerospace Testing and Facilities Operations and Maintenance (ATOM)  
Request for Proposal  
NNA08220778R - AMA

**Introduction**

This document highlights significant aspects of the attached Aerospace Testing and Facilities Operations and Maintenance Request for Proposal (RFP). Included in this overview is a brief discussion of some of the issues related to the contract scope and intent, incentives, selection criteria, and other issues of significance to this acquisition. The discussion also provides some insight into the reasoning that went into the formulation of the RFP. These highlights also provide a section-by-section account of important information regarding the RFP. However, these highlights should not be a substitute for a thorough and comprehensive review of the RFP.

The Government's intent is to enter into a single award, indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contractual arrangement, which will allow the Ames Research Center to perform successfully meet its mission of providing high quality testing services in its aerospace facilities in a safe manner and at a competitive price.

**Current Contract Information:**

The proposed acquisition is a follow-on to the current contract, NNA04BA85C, that is presently being performed by Jacobs Technology Inc. (JTI). Contract NNA04BA85C provides operation, maintenance, repair, and support of test, calibration, and support facilities at ARC over a five-year performance period with a current staff of approximately 100, at a current estimated value of \$124M. Contract NNA04BA85C is a performance-based, hybrid cost-plus-incentive-fee/award-fee (CPIF/AF) contract that was awarded on a competitive basis to JTI in 2004, and is scheduled to expire on July 31, 2009.

The Statement of Work (SOW) is Performance-Based, written in terms of functional requirements implemented by Contract Task Orders (CTOs). The contractor works jointly with NASA to operate and maintain the Center's aerospace test facilities. The current contract includes an organizational conflict of interest clause.

The current contract is incentivized using Incentive Fee for Cost performance and Award Fee for Quality, Safety, and Timeliness. By splitting Cost Performance out of the Award Fee, the Government was able to focus on making cost reduction improvements.

**Information Specifically Related to this Acquisition:**

This acquisition will be issued for Full and Open competition for a Single Award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract for five (5) years with a two-year base period and three one-year options.

The NAICS code and Size Standard is 561210 – Facility Support Services with a size standard of \$35.5M.

The contract awarded from this solicitation will also be Performance-Based. The SOW is formatted such that the Contractor should have a clear understanding of the required outcomes rather than the expected effort. This is intended to allow the Contractor autonomy and responsibility to manage its resources and to encourage the partnership between NASA and the Contractor.

However, this contract will not have an Award Fee component. The contract is anticipated to be Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee with **both** Cost and Performance Incentives. Please refer to Clause G.10, Incentive Fee Process and Attachment J.1(a)12, Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan, for more information.

The primary mission of the aerospace test facilities and the Ames operating organizations remains constant. The Government expects that nearly all activities will be accomplished through teams consisting of NASA and Contractor personnel. The number of tests and projects, and the customer base served under this contract continue to change. These factors, as well as other potential changes and the desired improvements the Government intends to achieve, require a significant amount of flexibility for the NASA/Contractor teams to function.

Contract Task Orders (CTOs) will continue to be a critical tool used for this contract since the Government cannot precisely predict the magnitude of services that will be required during the life of this contract. The Government intends to issue a relatively small number of CTOs, typically at six month intervals during the life of the contract, which will allow the Contractor to address changes in requirements. Target Costs will be used to establish both the cost and performance incentives to reward the Contractor for meeting performance metrics.

All of the issues discussed above were factors in the development of the selection criteria to be used for evaluating the proposals received as a result of this Final RFP. The evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost, have been developed and prioritized to allow the Government the ability to choose a Contractor which it believes will best meet the objectives of this contract. All evaluation factors, Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost, are essentially equal to each other. Evaluation factors other than Cost, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost.

Past Performance will be evaluated based on the corporate entities and subcontracting arrangements that are being proposed. The Past Performance of these performing entities along with the quantity of relevant experience will be of importance in determining a rating. Past Performance Questionnaires will be utilized to determine which offerors have a demonstrated ability to succeed in meeting similar contract requirements.

### **Industry Comments/Questions**

NASA thanks those who submitted questions and comments. Where appropriate, the Government has modified the relevant sections of the RFP in order to reflect suggestions from industry, or to address issues of consistency, ambiguity, or vagueness. Please see the questions with responses posted on January 26 and 27, 2009. HOWEVER, offerors are reminded that proposals will be evaluated based on the Final RFP and not on the responses to questions that were posted.

**Offerors interesting in viewing the current Collective Bargaining Agreement may request a copy by email to [Ronnee.R.Gonzalez@nasa.gov](mailto:Ronnee.R.Gonzalez@nasa.gov)**

Provision L.2 includes a website ([http://windtunnels.arc.nasa.gov/rfp\\_info/](http://windtunnels.arc.nasa.gov/rfp_info/)) to allow offerors to review detailed working documents used in managing and operating the facilities under this contract.

## Specific Highlights by Section

The information presented below, by section, is used to delineate significant aspects of the RFP that the offeror should be aware of.

### 1. SECTION B - SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICE/COSTS

**NOTE: PLEASE READ THIS SECTION OF THE SOLICITATION CAREFULLY.** As stated above, this contract is anticipated to be Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee with both Cost and Performance Incentives.

- The minimum amount of supplies or services that shall be ordered during the effective period of this contract is \$300,000. The maximum amount of supplies or services that may be ordered for the potential 5 year period of the contract is \$200,000,000.00. **Task Orders for Other Direct Costs (Line Item 03) will be issued on a cost only basis.** (see Changes from Draft RFP, below)
- During the performance of the resulting contract, the Government plans to issue task orders with clearly defined objectives, thus avoiding open-ended requirements. This approach will allow the Government to more accurately define the risk and costs associated with each task assignment.
- The Government envisions that a small number of task orders may be authorized within the first 90 days of the contract; however, the number of task orders could increase or decrease based on the Government requirements. Task orders under this contract are expected to vary in complexity, risk, and duration.
- Note that 2 clauses, B.1, *Supplies/Services to be Provided*, and B.6, *Estimated Cost and Fees*, contain fill-ins for an offeror to complete. In B.1, the offeror will complete the total Phase-In Costs proposed. For B.6, the offeror will complete the maximum incentive fee.
- Note that Clause B.4, *Limitation Of Indirect Costs*, limits the indirect costs in excess of the ceiling rates set forth in Attachment J.1(a) 5, *Direct Labor Rates, Fringe Rates, Indirect Rates, Incentive Fee, and Ceiling Rate Matrices*.

**CHANGE FROM DRAFT RFP:** The following changes have been made:

- Clause B.1: A definition of Other Direct Costs for Line Item 03 has been included as: "Other Direct Costs for CLIN 03 consist of all Materials/Supplies, Travel, and Training, but do not include service contracts."
- Clause B.6 is revised to:
  - Reflect that Target, Minimum, and Maximum Incentive Fee definitions are included in Attachment J.1.(a)12, Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan.
  - Revised to reflect one line each for Minimum, Target, and Maximum Incentive Fees.
  - Clarify the Fee percentages and ratios area in accordance with the revised G.10, Incentive Fee Process, (see G.10 revisions below) and Attachment J.1(a)12, Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan
  - The sharing ratio for underruns has been revised to 60/40.

## **2. SECTION C - DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATION/WORK STATEMENT**

- The Statement of Work (SOW) describes the requirements for the work to be performed under this contract. The SOW is intentionally written describing the overall scope of ATOM requirement to be accomplished.
- Task orders will clearly state the objectives of each task order with applicable costs, and cost and performance incentives. This approach will enable the Government to monitor performance, and the Contractor to meet the Government's requirements in a cost effective and timely manner.

### **CHANGE FROM DRAFT RFP:**

- Section C.3.3.2, Maintenance, Calibration, and Repair, has been revised to reflect NASA Policy Directive (NPD) 8730.1 and Ames Procedural Requirements (APR), Metrology and Calibration, These documents are being revised to reflect current ANSI Standard Z540.3-2006.
- Section C.3.3.3 is revised to reflect current requirements for NASA directed conferences.
- Section C.3.3.3.1 is revised to include Conference-Related Financial Reporting, Report 23 of Attachment J.1(a)2, Contract Data Requirements List
- Section C.3.3.3.8 title is revised to reflect "Facility Specific"

## **3. SECTION D – PACKAGING AND MARKING**

No significant features or issues in this section.

## **4. SECTION E – INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE**

No significant features or issues in this section.

## **5. SECTION F – DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE**

- Contract level reports and other deliverables are included in Section J as Attachment J.1 (a) 2, *Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL)*.
- Contract Task Orders will include a schedule for specific task deliverables that are not included in the CDRL.

## **6. SECTION G – CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA**

- Clause G.10 *Incentive Fee Process* provides the process, in conjunction with the Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan, for evaluation of the Contractor's performance.
- The Government has developed a Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan, Attachment J.1(a)12, for the Incentive Fee portion of this contract.

**CHANGE FROM DRAFT RFP:** Clause G.10 has been revised to reflect:

- Emphasis that cost and performance fee evaluations will be used, in accordance with NFS1817.207-70(b)(1) for determination to exercise options.
- Deletion of “6 months” reference in paragraphs (c) and (e)(2), and deletion of “Performance” from the title of Attachment J.1(a)12 in (e)(2).
- Revision to paragraph (b) that the CTO Target Cost Incentive Fee is 50% of the Maximum Cost Incentive Fee for the CTO.
- Clarification in paragraph (d)(5) that fee will be determined in accordance with Attachment J.1(a)12, Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan.
- Revision to paragraph (e)(1) that there is no Target Performance Incentive Fee.

## **7. SECTION H – SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS**

- Clause H.2, *Organizational Conflicts Of Interest, And Limitation Of Future Contracting*, includes information regarding potential conflicts of interest for this acquisition.
- **NOTE:** the nature and restriction specified in the Organizational Conflict of Interest clause is not identical to the current contract. **For this acquisition, the offeror will be required to submit a Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Avoidance Plan with its proposal. In addition, an OCI Avoidance Plan may be required in response to individual task orders.**
- In accordance with clause H.4, NFS 1852.216-80, *Task Order Procedure*, and as part of the task order negotiations process, the Contracting Officer and the Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) will assess the direct labor and indirect rates proposed for the individual task orders, and compare them against the successful offeror’s original proposal.
- Note that clause H.12, *Incorporation of the Contractor’s Proposal* has been revised since the DRFP. (see Changes from Draft RFP, below)
- Please review closely the requirements of clause H.13 *Small Disadvantaged Business Participation – Contract Targets* which will require completion in the Offeror’s proposal.
- Please review closely clause H.14, *Small Disadvantaged Business Participation – Contract Targets (Offeror Fill In)* as this is a fairly new requirement.

**CHANGE FROM DRAFT RFP:**

- Clause H.10, *Incorporation of the Contractor’s Proposal*, has been revised to include the Offeror’s Cost Volume and delete the fill-in for proposal number
- Clause H.15, *Contractor Purchasing*, has been expanded.

## **8. SECTION I – CONTRACT CLAUSES**

- Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel clause (See Paragraph I.2) addresses the contractor’s compliance agency personal identity verification procedures identified in the contract that implement Homeland Security Presidential Directive-12 (HSPD-12), Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance M-05-24, and Federal Information Processing Standards Publication (FIPS PUB) Number 201.

- FAR Clauses 52.203-13 *Contractor Code of Business Ethics and Conduct*; and 52.244-6 *Subcontracts for Commercial Items* are dated December 2008 to reflect FAC 2005-28 which will become effective December 12, 2008.
- **NOTE:** The following FAR clauses 52.219-4 *Notice Of Price Evaluation Preference For Hubzone Small Business Concerns*; 52.219-23 *Notice Of Price Evaluation Adjustment For Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns*; and 52.227-23, *Rights to Proposal Data (Technical)* are included by reference yet have areas requiring the Offeror to complete.
- 52.219-28, *Post-Award Small Business Program Re-representation (June 2007)*, has been included by reference.

#### **CHANGE FROM DRAFT RFP:**

- Clause I.1:
  - FAR 52.227-3, Patent Indemnity has been deleted.
  - FAR 52.223-15, Energy Efficiency in Energy-Consuming Products has been added by reference into I.1
- Clause I.9, Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires clause has been completed.

### **9. SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

Significant Attachments included in this Solicitation:

- J.1(a)1 – Wage Determinations
- J.1(a)2 – Contract Data Requirements List – see revisions below
- J.1(a)10 – DoD Contract Security Classification Specification (DD254)
- J.1(a)12 – Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan – see revisions below
- J.1(b)1 – As noted above, the current contractor has a staff of approximately 100 work-year-equivalents. The Government Labor Estimate is included; however, it has been revised for the final RFP. (see Changes from Draft RFP below) The Government Labor Estimates are not intended to represent a binding requirement since the exact skill mix and work distribution are dependent on task orders issued after the contract is awarded. The offeror is required to use the Government estimates for proposal purposes.
- J.1(b)3 – Pricing Attachment (see Changes from Draft RFP below)

#### **CHANGES FROM DRAFT RFP:**

Section J, page J-1 – Included Attachment dates and number of pages where possible.

Revisions were made to the Attachments shown below:

- J.1(a)2 – Contract Data Requirements List –
  - updated the mail-stop for the Resource Management Office
  - Report 23, Conference-Related Expense Report has been added
- J.1(a)12 – Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan – revised as follows:
  - Section 2.0 to reflect that fee evaluation will be used in determining to exercise options;
  - Section 2.2 to clarify the acronyms for target, minimum, and maximum cost incentive fees
  - Appendix A to clarify the Acceptable Quality Levels; deleted “target” performance incentives and revised performance incentive fee earned for

- scores 60-99 to be equal to the score. and clarified the frequency for A.2.2.1 to match clause G.10 (deleted 6 months)
    - Appendix A is revised to clarify that there is no “Target Performance Fee”, in accordance with Section B
    - Appendix B is added to discuss Performance Incentive Fee calculation
  - J.1(b)1 – Government Labor Estimate and Descriptions –
    - The Government Labor Estimate has been revised to separate the estimated hours for the 23 month Base Period from the three 12-month option years (a new worksheet added).
    - Clarified the work with “outside organizations” in the position descriptions for Computer Programmers’ and Computer System Analysts to reflect test customers.
  - J.1(b)3 – Title revised to correspond with title when this attachment is incorporated by reference into the contract.
  - J.1(b)6 – Past Performance Questionnaire – realigned and combined questions to match Section L revisions

## **10. SECTION K - REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORS**

No significant features or issues in this section.

### **CHANGE FROM DRAFT RFP:**

- FAR 52.209-5 is added to Section K to reflect revision dated December 2008.

## **11. SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS**

### **OFFERORS ARE ADVISED TO REVIEW THIS SECTION CAREFULLY.**

- FAR 52.215-1, *Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition*, ensures that offerors are aware that the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)), unless the Contracting Officer determines that discussions are necessary. Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. The Government seeks to maximize the quality of the offeror's initial proposal, improve the efficiency of the selection process, and reduce lead-time.
- For purposes of proposal submission, an Other Direct Costs (ODCs) estimate is provided for use in the offeror's cost model response and represents the Government's current best estimate of the contract requirements. (see Changes from Draft RFP below)
- Offeror's should closely read the instructions carefully and ensure that: page counts are not exceeded; that the information submitted is relevant to the oral proposal and written proposal volumes and sections; is formatted as requested; and is complete and accurate. Please note that for this acquisition, a Major Subcontract is defined as a subcontract valued at or over \$500,000.00 for the life of this contract, including options.
- An e-Library link has been posted on NAIS and will be included in the final solicitation for documents listed in provision L.2 *AVAILABILITY OF SPECIFICATIONS NOT LISTED IN*

*THE GSA INDEX OF FEDERAL SPECIFICATIONS, STANDARDS AND COMMERCIAL ITEM DESCRIPTIONS.*

- Pre-Solicitation Conference (see *Changes from Draft RFP below*)
- The Mission Suitability (Volume I) consists of an Oral Presentation (see FAR 15.102 and solicitation provision L.8, *Instructions For Mission Suitability Oral Presentations*). The format of the Mission Suitability subfactors can be found at paragraph L.9, *Proposal Preparation—Specific Instructions*. (see *Changes from Draft RFP below*)
- Subfactor 4 under the Mission Suitability factor is Small Business Utilization providing for a separate and distinct evaluation of Small Business Utilization. Although Small Businesses are not required to submit Small Business subcontracting plans, this provision requires small businesses to provide subcontracting information in their proposal.

**CHANGES FROM DRAFT RFP:**

Throughout Section L, reference to the title of Attachment J.1(b)3, “Pricing Exhibits”, or reference to “Cost Exhibits” have been revised to reflect “Direct Labor Rates, Fringe Rates, Indirect Rates, Incentive Fee, and Ceiling Rate Matrices”, the same title as the document will be when incorporated as J.1(a)5, by reference, into the contract. In addition, the following revisions have been made:

- L.2, Availability of Specification – updated to revise the Wind Tunnel website address and to include the website for the Technical Reference Documents
- L.3, Preproposal Conference – updated to delete the information originally provided and to add link to conference information
- L.6(b), Proposal Preparation – General, is revised as follows (by paragraph):
  - (1) – corrected the number of Electronic copies required for the Cost/Price Proposal volume to “2”
  - (2) – 4<sup>th</sup> bullet – revised to delete comment on sharing ratio
  - (2) – 5<sup>th</sup> bullet – corrected clause numbers
  - (6) – revised to clarify that an **electronic copy** of the Cover Letter may be included with the electronic version of Volume 1
- L.7, Proposal Page Limitations – is clarified to reflect
  - The Offeror’s Collective Bargaining Agreements are not included in the page limitations
  - Page limitation for the Past Performance Volume is increased to 35 pages.
- L.8, Instructions for Mission Suitability Oral Proposals – updated to clarify
  - (d) Presentation order
  - (g) Offerors may request copies of the Government’s recording
  - (h) and (k) – an increase in presentation time to 120 minutes.
- L.9, Proposal Preparations – General:
  - (a)(3) – clarified that probable cost adjustments could, if determined to be a mission suitability weakness, adversely affect the offeror’s Mission Suitability score.
  - (a)(3) Index of Subfactors – Element 2 includes both Sample Tasks.
  - (a)(3)A – revised the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet to add utilization to the offeror’s approach to staying abreast of innovative technologies.
  - (a)(3)B.2. – Sample tasks previously posted are revised to request the offerors to provide a total estimated cost for the sample tests and to provide the offerors with a period of performance for each sample task.



- (a)(3)B.4. – Deleted the requirement for Position Descriptions from the Oral Presentation
- (a)(3)B.7. – Clarified the requirement for Position Descriptions to be included in the Key Personnel written proposal
- (b)A 1-4 – Merged and realigned the questions.
- (c) – Clarified ODCs definition to reflect the revisions to Section B, Item 03.
- (c) – Separated the annual value for Item 03, “ODCs” from an annual value to be used for Items 02, 04, and 05 “services”
- (c) – Included a reminder that fee is not applicable to Section B, Item 03.
- Clause L.11, Wage Determinations and Collective Bargaining Agreement Availability has been added, explaining that a copy of the incumbent’s collective bargaining agreement can be obtained by written request to the Contracting Officer.

## **12. SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS AND AWARD**

The evaluation approach is outlined in paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach.

**OFFERORS ARE ADVISED TO REVIEW THIS SECTION CAREFULLY.**

### **CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RFP:**

- M.2.B(b)2. – Revised the NFS Levels of Confidence to reflect the current NFS definitions
- M.2.B(c) Index and (c)B.2 – Revised to reflect Section L changes for Sample Tasks
- M.2.B(c)B.4 – Deleted Position Descriptions from Oral Presentations
- M.2.B(c)B.7 – Added Position Descriptions to Key Personnel written proposal
- M.2.B(d)A 1-4 – revised to match revisions in Section L
- M.2.B(e) –
  - Clarified that any proposed fee amount is not adjusted in the probable cost assessment.
  - Revised the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet of 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph to match NFS language
  - Clarified confidence level and Phase-in cost reasonableness evaluation.
  - Deleted Sample Task Cost Evaluation. Sample Tasks will be evaluated in Mission Suitability only.
  - Revised 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to reflect NFS language that probable cost adjustments could, if determined to be a mission suitability weakness, adversely affect the offeror’s Mission Suitability score.
- M.3 (b) – Clarified that probable cost adjustments could, if determined to be a mission suitability weakness, adversely affect the offeror’s Mission Suitability score.

End of Specific Highlights by Section

## **Conclusion**

This concludes the Highlights for the ATOM Final RFP. **At this time the “Blackout” period has started. All communications must be addressed to the Contracting Officer.** Any questions should be submitted in writing to the Contracting Officer. Mail questions to the address below, email them to [Ronnee.R.Gonzalez@nasa.gov](mailto:Ronnee.R.Gonzalez@nasa.gov) or fax them to 650-604-0270.

NASA Ames Research Center  
Attn: Ronnee R. Gonzalez  
Code JAC: 227-4  
Re: NNA08220778R (AMA)  
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000

As a final note, the information provided in these highlights is not intended to be construed differently from the information in the RFP. Should an apparent conflict in interpretation exist, the information in the RFP, including amendments, take precedence.